



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,632	10/23/2003	Udo Henning Stoewer	244214US41CONT	9162

22850 7590 04/01/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

SHARP, JEFFREY ANDREW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3677

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/690,632

Applicant(s)

STOEWER ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey Sharp

Art Unit

3677

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-30.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

The after final amendment to the claims submitted on 04 March 2005 has been considered, but not entered, as it raises the new issue of a positively recited "sealant layer" on the locking portion. As it was previously presented, the locking portion was merely 'configured to obtain a layer of sealant' as an intended use.


Applicant's arguments filed 04 March 2005 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. The King Jr. '572 reference is silent about a residual sealant layer; however, it is inherent that at least some remaining adhesive or sealant will reside on the locking portion even after a collar is swaged thereon.

Huck '759 was used in the previous Final Office Action (sent 04 November 2004) as extrinsic supporting evidence (page 2 line 126-page 3 line 2), as provided by MPEP 2131.01, to show that it is both inherent and obvious to have at least a miniscule remaining layer of sealant between a locking collar and bolt after swaging, without disadvantageously affecting the swaged connection between the collar and bolt. In fact, the Huck reference itself (standing alone) anticipates all of the limitations found in claims 1 and 16, as well as dependent claims 4, 8-15, 20, and 24-30. (Huck shows parallelogram lands 32 formed by grooves 34 and groove 50 and a sealant layer 48. The instant claim 1 is anticipated by Huck in Figure 1). Huck '759 further shows a smooth tapered portion 36 connecting the locking portion and cylindrical shank portion as disclosed by Applicant in newly added claim 31.

The Mosc '808 reference suggests that "the sealing compound fills all the clearances". The Mosc reference, therefore, also serves as supporting evidence that a sealant layer may remain between the lockbolt and collar after swaging, because it would flow into all gaps, clearances, and crevices that remain undisplaced by the collar.

See also, previously cited supporting reference Ardell US-3,139,786 Col 2 lines 50-54, which even further serves as extrinsic evidence by suggesting an inherent sealant layer between a collar and locking portion after swaging.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The prior art of record substantially discloses the subject matter claimed (see attached notes).

  
JJ Swann  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 3600